



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ph

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,029	08/06/2003	Masuyuki Takeda	1163-0466P	7366
2292 7590 02/09/2007 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			EXAMINER PEIKARI, BEHZAD	
			ART UNIT 2189	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/09/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/09/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/635,029

Applicant(s)

TAKEDA, MASUYUKI

Examiner

B. James Peikari

Art Unit

2189

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to because title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

3. The specification is objected to because there are minor errors in English idiom throughout that should be corrected. A substitute specification is not necessary. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-9 are objected to because informalities, such as the following examples shown from the first chain of claims (claims 1, 2 and 7) only:

(A) In claim 1, lines 4 and 6, "the replaying of" should replace "replaying".

(B) In claim 7, line 3, either "in" or "across" should replace "in across"

Appropriate correction to all claims is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examples are show for the first chain of claims (claims 1, 2 and 7) only:

(A) In claim 1, line 4, the antecedent basis of “a logical sector number” is unclear; i.e., it is unclear whether it is the same as that of line 2.

(B) In claim 1, lines 6-7, the antecedent basis of “a predetermined logical sector number” is unclear; i.e., it is unclear whether it is the same as that of line 2 or line 4 or both.

(C) In claim 1, line 8, the antecedent basis of “a logical block number” is unclear; i.e., it is unclear whether it is the same as that of line 7.

(D) In claim 1, lines 10-11, the antecedent basis of “a logical sector number” is unclear; i.e., it is unclear whether it is the same as that of lines 2 or 4 or 6-7 or any combination thereof.

(E) In claim 1, line 11, the antecedent basis of “the logical block number acquired” is unclear; i.e., it is unclear whether it is the same as that acquired in lines 7 and 9 or in line 8, or all three.

(F) In claim 1, line 12, the antecedent basis of “the logical sector number acquired” is unclear; i.e., logical sector numbers are acquired in lines 2 and 4.

(G) In claim 2, line 4, “accompanying” is unclear.

(H) In claim 7, line 2, the use of “the logical sector number” is confusing; i.e., it is unclear how one sector number could indicate a position across plural sectors.

Similar errors exist the remaining claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 are withdrawn due to the ambiguities noted in section 7 of this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 are withdrawn due to the ambiguities noted in section 7 of this Office action.

Response to Amendment

9. It is not possible from the claims as written for the examiner to properly determine the scope of this language or to determine the metes and bounds of the claims.

Due to the ambiguities and confusion in claims 1-9 as cited above, no art has been applied thereto, see *In re Steele*, 49 CCPA 1295, 305 F. 2d 859, 134 USPQ 292

Art Unit: 2189


(1962) and *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494 (CCPA 1970). The examiner will not speculate as to the intended meaning.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Peikari whose telephone number is (571) 272-4185. The examiner is generally available between 7:00 am and 7:30 pm, EST, Monday through Wednesday, and between 5:30 am and 4:00 pm on Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Reginald Bragdon, can be reached at (571) 272-4204. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



B. James Peikari
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2189
2/4/07